<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-24 remain in the present application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

<u>Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102</u>

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0103914 by Dutta et al. (hereafter referred to as "Dutta"). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Dutta for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites a method for analyzing content on a web page comprising (emphasis added):

> accessing said web page comprising content;
> <u>processing the web page through a filter, wherein the filter transfers the content of the web page to an analyzer;</u>
> <u>analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer,</u> wherein said analyzing is distinct from said processing;
> returning a result of said analyzing to a server;
> appending the result of said analyzing to the content of said web page; and
> displaying said web page and said result.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-5, 7, 8-14, 16, 18-22 and 24 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "processing the web page through a filter, wherein the filter transfers the content of the web page to an analyzer" and "analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, content of a web page is processed by a filter. The content is then transferred to an analyzer for analysis.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Dutta to teach that content is evaluated before it is filtered. For example, Dutta teaches that content evaluator 550 evaluates the content, *then* passes it to personalized accessibility evaluation provider 530 for removal of certain search results (paragraphs 135-137). Assuming arguendo that evaluation as taught by Dutta is analogous to analyzing as claimed, and also assuming arguendo that removal of certain search results as taught by Dutta is analogous to filtering as claimed, Applicants respectfully submit that Dutta teaches that content is processed by a filter *after* analysis instead of *before* analysis as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "processing the web page through a filter, wherein the filter transfers the content of the web page to an analyzer" and "analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer" as recited in independent Claim 1.

Although pages 4 and 5 of the rejection state that merely supplying data as taught by Dutta is analogous to processing data as claimed, Applicants respectfully disagree. Whereas processing is performed by the claimed filter (e.g., see step 214 of Figure 2 and corresponding description of step 214), Dutta teaches that the search results are merely supplied to content evaluator 550 by personalized accessibility evaluation provider 530 (see the last sentence of

paragraph 134 and the first sentence of paragraph 135). As such, by merely conveying the search results, Applicants respectfully submit that the personalized accessibility evaluation provider does not process the search results as claimed. Thus, although Dutta may teach that personalized accessibility evaluation provider 530 filters results *after* evaluation by evaluation provider 550 as discussed above, Applicants reiterate that Dutta fails to teach or suggest processing content *before* analysis as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said filter is selectively activated by a webpage development tool accessible to said first computing system" as recited in dependent Claim 3. As recited and described in the present application, the filter is selectively activated by a webpage development tool accessible to the first computing system.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Dutta of a filter that is selectively activated as claimed. Further, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion of a filter which is selectively activated *by a webpage development tool* as claimed. And further, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion of a filter which is selectively activated by a webpage development tool *accessible to a first computing system* (e.g., on which an application server operates which accesses the webpage comprising content as recited in Claim 2) as claimed.

Although page 6 of the rejection states that filtering is activated by a personalized accessibility evaluation provider (paragraphs 19 and 133), Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants understand the cited portion of

Dutta to merely teach filtering *performed* by the personalized accessibility evaluation provider. Applicants find no teaching or suggestion in Dutta of activating the filtering, nor do Applicants find any teaching or suggestion in Dutta of filtering which is *selectively* activated (e.g., filtering in some cases and not filtering in others) as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Dutta fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said filter is selectively activated by a webpage development tool accessible to said first computing system" as recited in dependent Claim 3.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Dutta, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 9 and 17 recite limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 9 and 17 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 2-5, 7, 8-14, 16, 18-22 and 24 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-5, 7, 8-14, 16, 18-22 and 24 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Dutta. Therefore, Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16-22 and 24 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0156799 by Markel et al. (hereafter referred to as "Markel"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are not rendered obvious by Dutta in view of Markel for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Markel, either alone or in combination with Dutta, fails to cure the deficiencies of Dutta discussed above. Specifically, Markel also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "processing the web page through a filter, wherein the filter transfers the content of the web page to an analyzer" and "analyzing the content of the web page at said analyzer" as recited in independent Claim 1, and similarly recited in independent Claims 9 and 17. Since dependent Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are not rendered obvious by Dutta in view of Markel. Therefore, Claims 6, 8, 15 and 23 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 2/13 , 2008   _BMF_

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060